

UNCLASSIFIED

AD 268 917

*Reproduced
by the*

ARMED SERVICES TECHNICAL INFORMATION AGENCY
ARLINGTON HALL STATION
ARLINGTON 12, VIRGINIA



UNCLASSIFIED

NOTICE: When government or other drawings, specifications or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely related government procurement operation, the U. S. Government thereby incurs no responsibility, nor any obligation whatsoever; and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

62-1-5
XEROX

CATALOGED BY ASTIA 268917
AS AD No.

268 917

NON-LINEAR REGRESSION WITH MINIMAL ASSUMPTIONS

BY
HARVEY M. WAGNER

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 99
NOVEMBER 30, 1961

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT Nonr-225 (50)
(NR-047-004)
FOR
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
Applied Mathematics and Statistics Laboratories
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
Stanford, California



NON-LINEAR REGRESSION WITH MINIMAL ASSUMPTIONS

by

Harvey M. Wagner

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 99

November 30, 1961

PREPARED UNDER CONTRACT Nonr-225(50)

(NR-047-004)

FOR

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for
any Purpose of the United States Government

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Applied Mathematics and Statistics Laboratories

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Stanford, California

NON-LINEAR REGRESSION WITH MINIMAL ASSUMPTIONS

by

Harvey M. Wagner
Stanford University

A curvilinear regression model is treated by linear programming methods, so as to require only mild restrictions on the nature of the non-linearities.

1. Introduction

Consider the regression model

$$(1) \quad y = \sum_{j=1}^p f_j(x_j) + \text{error}$$

where y is the dependent variable, and x_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, are the independent variables. Assume there are available k sets of observations on the variables, viz., y_i and x_{ij} , $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, and that we wish to estimate the functions $f_j(x_j)$ from these data.* We do not

* One of the x_j may represent a dummy variable, $x_{ij} = 1$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

impose the restriction that every $f_j(x_j)$ must be linear, and thus our model may be categorized as curvilinear regression. The usual statistical technique for such models is to specify a mathematical form for each of the functions $f_j(x_j)$, such as $ax_j + bx_j^2$ or $\log x_j$, and

then to estimate the parameters in the specified forms according to a least squares criterion. An alternative approach, given in [4], employs criteria that permit the use of linear programming models for obtaining the estimated parameter values. In this paper we do not go so far as specifying a mathematical form for the $f_j(x_j)$; rather we impose only mild restrictions on the behavior of the functions; for example, a given $f_j(x_j)$ must be monotonically increasing. Utilizing a linear programming approach, we are able to estimate the functions $f_j(x_j)$ given only the minimal assumptions as to the required shape. In Section 2 we adopt "minimal sum of absolute deviations" as the criterion of best fit; in Section 5 we review alternative criteria.

2. Basic Formulation

To begin, suppose that for each j the values of x_{ij} are distinct, $x_{ij} \neq x_{kj}$ if $i \neq k$. Let $f_j(x_{ij}) = f_{ij}$. Our procedure is to find values for the f_{ij} .

For each observation y_i , we have an Error Constraint,

$$(2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^p f_{ij} + \epsilon_{1i} - \epsilon_{2i} = y_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

$$\epsilon_{1i} \geq 0, \quad \epsilon_{2i} \geq 0.$$

As is explained in detail in [4], ϵ_{1i} and ϵ_{2i} are interpreted as vertical deviations "above" and "below" the fitted regression function for the i -th set of observations; i.e., the sum $\epsilon_{1i} + \epsilon_{2i}$ represents the absolute deviation between the estimated fit for $\sum_{j=1}^p f_j(x_{ij})$ and y_i . Our criterion of best fit is a minimal sum of the absolute deviations.

Next we impose Weak Curvature Constraints on the f_{ij} . To illustrate, we suppose for $j = 1$, $x_{11} < x_{21} < x_{31} < \dots < x_{k1}$, and we postulate that $f_1(x_1)$ is a monotonic increasing function. Then the Weak Curvature Constraints for the set of f_{i1} are

$$(3a) \quad f_{i1} \leq f_{i+1,1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1.$$

In other words, we impose by (3a) a complete ordering on the f_{ij} . By reversing the inequality in (3a), we thereby would impose the restriction that $f_1(x_1)$ be monotonically decreasing. If instead we hypothesize that $f_1(x_1)$ is unimodal, the peak occurring, for example, at a value of x between x_{31} and x_{41} , the Weak Curvature Constraints for the set of f_{i1} are

$$(3b) \quad f_{i1} \leq f_{i+1,1}, \quad i = 1, 2; \quad f_{i1} \geq f_{i+1,1}, \quad i = 4, 5, \dots, k-1.$$

Notice that (3b) depends on being able to specify that the modal value occurs for an x between two given values of x_{i1} . The estimation of f_{i1} does not yield the modal value unless x equals one of the given x_{i1} .

Momentary reflection is sufficient to demonstrate that the foregoing analysis is modified in a straightforward manner if, for a given j , the x_{ij} values are not ordered monotonically. For example, if ordering the x_{i1} yields $x_{31} < x_{11} < x_{81} < x_{91} < x_{21} \dots$, and we postulate that $f_1(x_1)$ is a monotonically increasing function, then instead of the Weak Curvature Constraints (3a), we have

$$f_{31} \leq f_{11} \leq f_{81} \leq f_{91} \leq f_{21} \dots$$

Similarly, it is possible by a set of inequality constraints to impose partial orderings on the f_{ij} to produce bimodal functions, functions having both a single relative minimum and a single relative maximum, etc.

Up to this point, we have assumed that for each j the values of the x_{ij} are distinct. If, for a particular j , two or more values of x_{ij} are identical, then the corresponding f_{ij} must be equal. Consequently for each j it is only necessary to define a variable f_{ij} in (2) wherever identical values for x_{ij} occur. Likewise in (3) it is only necessary to define inequalities for the distinct f_{ij} .

The basic linear programming model may now be stated as finding values for the f_{ij} which

$$(4) \quad \text{minimize } \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_{1i} + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_{2i} \right],$$

subject to the linear constraints (2) and (3).

We complete our discussion of the basic formulation by determining the number of restrictive relations and variables that comprise the model. For the sake of definiteness, suppose that all the functions $f_j(x_j)$ are postulated to be monotonic. Let N be the total number of distinct f_{ij} to be included in the constraints.* Then (2) and (3) imply

* Specifically, for each j , let n_j be the total number of distinct values of x_{ij} ; then $N = \sum_{j=1}^p n_j$.

Number of Equalities = k (Error Constraints)

Number of Inequalities = $N - p$ (Weak Curvature Constraints)

Number of Variables = $N + 2k$ (f_{ij} , ϵ_{1i} , and ϵ_{2i}).

If slack variables are added to the Weak Curvature Constraints to convert them to equalities, we have

$$\text{Number of Equalities} = k + N - p$$

$$\text{Number of Variables} = 2(N + k) - p.$$

Although in some real regression applications these numbers need not be negligible, the method remains feasible since current linear programming computer codes are capable of solving several hundred equations in many hundreds of unknowns.

In our discussion so far we have restricted only ϵ_{1i} and ϵ_{2i} to be non-negative. In the next section we discuss placing analogous restrictions on the f_{ij} , but here we mention that if an f_{ij} is unrestricted in sign, then a common way of treating it within the usual format of a linear programming model having all non-negative variables is to let $f_{ij} \equiv f_{ij}^+ - f_{ij}^-$, $f_{ij}^+ \geq 0$, $f_{ij}^- \geq 0$, i.e., to substitute into the model restrictions in place of f_{ij} , the difference between two non-negative variables. This device increases the number of variables but has no effect on the number of constraints. We return to the question of model size in Section 4, where we discuss the dual formulation.

3. Additional Constraints

We may, if we wish, impose stronger properties on the estimated values for the $f_j(x_j)$ functions. We illustrate several such possibilities. We may add Positioning Constraints such as, for each j , some or all of the f_{ij} must be non-negative, the smallest f_{ij} must be no smaller than L_j , and the largest f_{ij} must be no larger than U_j . These restrictions are all representable as linear inequalities.

We may apply Strong Curvature Constraints instead of, or in addition to, (3). For example, if the estimate for $f_1(x_1)$ is to be strictly monotonically increasing and the minimal allowable difference between two adjacent values of f_{11} is to be δ_{11} , then (3a) would be modified to the linear relation

$$(3c) \quad f_{11} + \delta_{11} \leq f_{i+1,1} .$$

Similarly, if there is to be a maximal allowable difference η_{11} between two subsequent values of f_{11} , then we would add the linear constraints

$$(3d) \quad f_{11} + \eta_{11} \geq f_{i+1,1} .$$

The relations (3c) and (3d) imply absolute differences between adjacent values for f_{11} . It is also possible to impose constraints on the relative differences between values for f_{11} ; to illustrate, we may require

$$(3e) \quad (f_{21} - f_{11}) \leq \alpha(f_{31} - f_{21})$$

$$(f_{21} - f_{11}) \geq \beta(f_{31} - f_{21})$$

where α and β are given positive constants.

Finally, it is possible to specify an exact mathematical form for any particular $f_j(x_j)$. For example, if we postulate that $f_1(x_1) = ax_1^2$, then we modify (2) to

$$(5) \quad ax_{11}^2 + \sum_{j=2}^p f_{1j} + \epsilon_{11} - \epsilon_{21} = y_1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

and eliminate the Curvature Constraints for x_1 ; the linear programming model treats a as a variable in the optimization process.

4. Dual Formulation

As we have demonstrated earlier [4], there may be computational efficiencies arising from solving the dual linear programming problem [3]; in the process of optimizing the dual problem, an optimum solution to the original regression model is automatically generated [4]. We demonstrate the argument with reference to the example at the end of Section 2, postulating further the restrictions $f_{ij} \geq 0$. Let w_i denote the dual variables, where, in the primal model, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ correspond to the Error Constraints and $i = k+1, k+2, \dots, k+N-p$ correspond to the Weak Curvature Constraints. Then the dual relations associated with the error variables ϵ_{1i} and ϵ_{2i} are

$$(6a) \quad w_i \leq 1, \quad -w_i \leq 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

We make a transformation of variables

$$(7) \quad z_i = w_i + 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

and substitute $(z_i - 1)$ for w_i first into the N dual relations associated with the variable f_{ij} , and then into (6a), the latter yielding a set of upper bounds

$$(6b) \quad 0 \leq z_i \leq 2, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

As a result, we have in the dual model

Number of principal inequalities = N (corresponding to the primal f_{ij} variables)

Number of upper bound inequalities = k

Number of variables = $k + N - p$.

If slack variables are added to the principal inequalities, we have

Number of principal equalities = N

Number of upper bound inequalities = k

Number of variables = $2N + k - p$.

Therefore if the dual problem is solved directly instead of the primal model, a reduction of $(k-p)$ equations and k variables occurs at the extra computational expense of handling k bounded variables. There are efficient algorithms for solving bounded variables problems (see [2] and [3]) and a number of computer codes are available. If additional constraints are appended in the primal problem, such as those suggested in Section 3, then utilizing the dual problem becomes a more attractive approach since these relations increase only the number of dual variables and not the number of dual restrictions.

5. Alternative Objective Functions

Instead of employing a minimal sum of absolute deviations as a criterion of best fit, it is possible to use a Chebyshev or a least squares criterion. Under a Chebyshev criterion, we seek to find values for the f_{ij} which minimize the maximum absolute error between the fitted relation and y . To accomplish this aim, we have in place of (2) pairs of Error Constraints

$$(8) \quad \left. \begin{aligned} - \sum_{j=1}^p f_{ij} + \epsilon &\geq -y_i \\ \sum_{j=1}^p f_{ij} + \epsilon &\geq y_i \\ \epsilon &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k ,$$

and in place of (4), the objective function

$$(9) \quad \text{minimize } \epsilon .$$

Continuing with our example wherein there are N distinct f_{ij} , and $f_{ij} \geq 0$, we have in the primal model

$$\text{Number of inequalities} = 2k + N - p \quad (\text{Error and Weak Curvature Constraints})$$

$$\text{Number of variables} = N + 1 .$$

In the dual formulation the above values for the number of inequalities and variables are interchanged, leading to the conclusion that the dual is in general computationally more efficient to solve.

Under a least squares criterion, the only change in the basic formulation of Section 2 is the objective function, which is then stated as follows:

$$(10) \quad \text{minimize } \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_{1i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon_{2i}^2 \right] .$$

This problem is a quadratic programming model, and can be solved by a method such as that in [5], for which computer routines are available. It is also possible to employ a linear programming version if the squared functions in (10) are represented in terms of piecewise linear approximations [1].

6. Concluding Remarks

The model in this paper permits a large degree of flexibility in estimating non-linear regression functions.* If the underlying purpose

* We point out that the approach is well suited to situations in which the x_{ij} represent rank order measurements.

for finding the functions is entirely pragmatic, then one may utilize

the solution values for the f_{ij} without further consideration. To the extent that the ultimate purpose may be to discover simple "regression laws," then, once the values for the f_{ij} are found and plotted against x_{ij} , one may wish to postulate a particular mathematical form for each $f_j(x_j)$ function, and estimate the parameters in the mathematical forms either by least squares or by linear programming methods.

REFERENCES

- [1] Charnes, A., and C. E. Lemke, "Minimization of Non Linear Separable Convex Functions," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 1(1954), 301-312.
- [2] Wagner, H. M., "The Dual Simplex Algorithm for Bounded Variables," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 5(1958), 257-261.
- [3] Wagner, H. M., "Practical Guide to the Dual Theorem," Operations Research, 6(1958), 364-384.
- [4] Wagner, H. M., "Linear Programming Techniques for Regression Analysis," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 54(1959), 206-212.
- [5] Wolfe, P., "The Simplex Method for Quadratic Programming," Econometrica, 27(1959), 382-398.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

CONTRACT Nonr-225(50)

(NR 047-00A)

Office of Naval Research Branch Office 346 Broadway New York 13, N. Y.	1	Director Operations Evaluation Group Office of Chief of Naval Operations (OP-030) Navy Dept. Washington 25, D. C.	2	Professor Max E. Bloom College of Business Administration Syracuse University Syracuse 10, New York	1
Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 E. Green Street Pasadena 1, California	1	Headquarters Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area United States Air Force Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma	1	Dean L. M. K. Realter School of Engineering University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1
Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco 9, California	1	Industrial College of the Armed Forces Fort Leasley J. McHair Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. L. L. Enkel	1	Professor James H. Boles University of California Agricultural Experiment Station Berkeley 4, California	1
Office of Naval Research Navy No. 100 Fleet Post Office New York, New York	2	Institute for Defense Analyses Communications Research Division Von Neumann Hall Princeton, New Jersey	1	Professor O. E. Brownlee Department of Economics University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1
Office of Naval Research Logistics Branch, Code 436 Dept. of the Navy T-5 Bldg. Washington 25, D. C.	10	Library American Power Jet Company 705 Grand Avenue Ridgefield, New Jersey	1	Professor S. S. Cairns Head, Dept. of Mathematics University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois	1
Headquarters, USAF Attn: AFASC - 6P Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office 86 E. Randolph Street Chicago 1, Illinois	1	Mr. Samuel L. Carroll 7022 Tokalon Drive Dallas, Texas	1
Logistics Research Project The Johns Hopkins University 707 - 22nd Street, N. W. Washington 7, D. C.	1	Superintendent U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Attn: Library Monterey, California	1	Professor A. Charnes The Technological Institute Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois	1
Operations Research Office The Johns Hopkins University 6935 Arlington Road Bethesda 14, Maryland	1	Electronic Computer Division Code 280 Bureau of Ships Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	2	Professor John S. Chipman Department of Economics University of Minnesota Minneapolis 14, Minnesota	1
United States Air Force Air University Library Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama	1	The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Professor Carl Crist Behavioral Sciences 202 Junipero Serra Stanford, California	1
U. S. Naval Supply Research and Development Facility Naval Supply Depot Bayonne, New Jersey	1	Management Controls, Ref. Library Huntington Rand, Div. of Sperry Rand Corp. 335 Fourth Avenue New York 10, N. Y.	1	Professor Randolph Church U. S. Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California	1
Weapons Systems Evaluation Group Pentagon Bldg. Washington 25, D. C.	1	University of Washington Inst. for Economic Research Seattle 5, Washington	1	Professor C. V. Churchman School of Business Administration University of California Berkeley 4, California	1
Ames Aeronautical Laboratory Moffett Field, California Attn: Technical Library	1	University of California Bureau of Business and Economic Research Berkeley 4, California	1	Professor W. V. Cooper Director of Research Department of Economics Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1
Armed Services Technical Information Agency Arlington Hall Station Arlington 12, Virginia	10	Mr. Adam Abruzzi Applied Statistics Group Department of Management Stevens Institute of Technology Hoboken, New Jersey	1	Professor Gerald Debrau Cowles Foundation for Research in Ecs. Yale Station, Box 2125 New Haven, Connecticut	1
The Director Naval Research Laboratory Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Tech. Information Office	1	Dr. S. G. Allen Stanford Research Institute Menlo Park, California	1	Professor Robert Dorfman Department of Economics Harvard University Cambridge 38, Massachusetts	1
Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Advanced Logistics Research Division (Code W5) Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1	Professor Leland Bach Department of Economics Carnegie Institute of Technology Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1	Mr. Louis Doros Management Engineering Staff Bureau of Yards and Docks Navy Department Washington 25, D. C.	1
Naval War College Logistics Dept., Luce Hall Newport, Rhode Island	1	Professor E. F. Beckenbach Department of Mathematics University of California Los Angeles 24, California	1	Rear Adm. H. E. Eccles, USN, Ret. 101 Washington Street Newport, Rhode Island	1
Director National Security Agency Attn: CS141(Rm. 2C087) Port George G. Meade, Maryland	1	Dr. Martin J. Beckmann Department of Economics Brown University Providence 12, Rhode Island	1	Mr. Daniel Ellsberg The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1
Director National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C.	1	Dr. Richard Bellman The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California	1	Alain Enthoven 3009 Holly Street Alexandria, Virginia	1
NACA Office for Aeronautics 1724 F. Street, N. W. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Chief, Office of Aeronautical Engineering	1			Professor Eberhard Fels 445 CL University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania	1
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts Code OW Department of the Navy Washington 25, D. C.	1				

Contract Nonr-225(50)
November 1961

Dr. Merrill M. Flood
Mental Health Research Institute
205 North Forest Avenue
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Professor David Gale
Department of Mathematics
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. Murray Geisler
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Professor B. Gelman
Department of Mathematics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Giannini Foundation Ground-Water Studies
Giannini Foundation of Agri. Economics
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Mr. R. J. D. Gillies
Marketing Research Department
Olin Matheson Chemical Corp.
275 Winchester Avenue
New Haven 4, Connecticut

Dr. R. E. Gomory
IBM Research
Yorktown Heights, New York

Professor Evi Griliches
Department of Economics
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

Dr. Isadore Heller
Navy Management Office
Washington 25, D. C.

Dr. Theodore E. Harris
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Dr. John C. Harsanyi
Department of Economics
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

Professor M. R. Hesenes
Department of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Professor C. Hildreth
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Mr. C. J. Hitch
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Dr. Alan J. Hoffman
IBM Research Center
Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York

Professor Austin Hoggatt
School of Business Administration
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Dr. C. C. Holt
Grad School of Industrial Administration
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

Dr. John W. Hooper
Cowles Foundation for Research
in Economics
Yale Station, Box 2125
New Haven, Connecticut

Professor H. Hotelling
Dept. of Mathematical Statistics
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Professor H. S. Houthakker
Department of Economics
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dr. H. M. Hughes
Department of Biometrics
School of Aviation Medicine
U.S.A.F.
Randolph Field, Texas

Professor Leonid Hurwicz
Department of Economics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Professor J. R. Jackson
Management Sciences Res. Proj.
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Professor Dale V. Jorgenson
Department of Economics
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Johns Hopkins University Library
Acquisitions Department
Baltimore 18, Maryland

Capt. Walter E. Keen, USN
Office of Naval Research
Code 400
Department of Navy
Washington 25, D. C.

Professor Lawrence Klein
Department of Economics
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Professor T. C. Koopmans
Cowles Foundation for Research
in Economics
Yale Station, Box 2125
New Haven, Connecticut

Professor Harold M. Kuhn
Department of Mathematics
Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Dr. Howard Laitin
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Dr. R. P. Lansellotti
Department of Economics
Washington State College
Pullman, Washington

Professor C. E. Lomke
Department of Mathematics
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

Professor W. W. Leontief
Department of Economics
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dr. Bernhard Lieberman
Center for International Affairs
6 Divinity Ave.
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Professor S. B. Littauer
Dept. of Industrial Engineering
Columbia University
New York 27, New York

Dr. R. Duncan Luce
Dept. of Psychology
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Craig A. Maguire
2954 Winchester Way
Rancho Cordova, California

Benoit Mandelbrot
International Business
Machines Corp.
Research Center
P. O. Box 218, Lamb Estate
Yorktown Heights, New York

Professor Julius Margolis
Department of Business Administration
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Mr. Harry M. Markowitz
Logistics Department
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Professor Jacob Marschak
School of Business Administration
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Thomas Marschak
School of Business Administration
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Professor Lionel M. McKenzie
Department of Economics
University of Rochester
River Campus Station
Rochester 20, New York

Mr. Joseph Mehr
Head, Operations Research Desk
U. S. N. Training Device Center
Fort Washington, L. I., New York

Dr. Richard A. Miller
4071 West 7th Street
Fort Worth 7, Texas

Professor Franco Modigliani
Grad. School of Industrial Administration
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

Professor James Moore
Dept. of Industrial Engineering
Northeastern University
Boston 12, Mass.

Professor O. Morgenstern
Econometric Research Program
Princeton University
92-A Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

D. E. Mowham
Chief, Industrial Engineering Div.
Comptroller
Edgus, San Bernardino Air Material Area
Norton Air Force Base, California

Mr. M. L. Morden
Research Division
College of Engineering
New York University
New York 53, New York

Professor R. R. O'Neill
Department of Engineering
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Mr. Richard V. Palermo
Operations Research Department
Willow Run Laboratories
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Professor Stanley Reiter
Department of Economics
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Professor M. Riley
301 Stephens Memorial Hall
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Professor D. Rosenblatt
Department of Statistics
The George Washington University
Washington 7, D. C.

Professor Murray Rosenblatt
Department of Mathematics
Brown University
Providence 12, Rhode Island

Professor A. E. Ross, Head
Department of Mathematics
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

Professor Jerome Rothenberg
Department of Economics
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Professor Albert E. Rubenstein
Department of Industrial Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Professor Herman Rubin
Department of Statistics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Professor Richard S. Rudner
Department of Philosophy
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Contract Econ-225(50)
November 1961

Professor F. A. Samelson
Department of Economics
M. I. T.
Cambridge 39, Massachusetts

Dr. I. Richard Savage
School of Business
Vincent Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis 14, Minnesota

Professor Andrew Schuts, Jr.
Dept. of Industrial Engineering
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Professor H. A. Simon
Dept. of Industrial Administration
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

Mr. J. R. Simpson
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts
Code 88
Arlington Annex
U. S. Department of Navy
Washington 25, D. C.

Professor Laurie Snell
Department of Mathematics
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Professor Robert Solow
Department of Economics
Mass. Inst. of Technology
Cambridge 39, Massachusetts

Professor Robert Summers
Department of Economics
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Professor Gerald Thompson
Dept. of Industrial Administration
Carnegie Institute of Technology
Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania

Professor R. M. Thrall
Department of Mathematics
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Professor L. M. Tichvinsky
Department of Engineering
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Professor James Tobin
Council of Economic Advisers
Executive Office of The President
Washington 25, D. C.

Professor C. B. Tompkins
Dept. of Mathematics
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Professor A. W. Tucker
Fine Hall, Box 708
Princeton, New Jersey

Professor Hirofumi Uzawa
Behavioral Sciences
202 Junipero Serra
Stanford, California

Professor D. F. Votaw, Jr.
Department of Economics
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Professor V. A. Wallis
207 Haskell Hall
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

Professor J. L. Walsh
Department of Mathematics
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dr. T. Whittin
School of Industrial Management
Mass. Institute of Technology
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Mr. Wayne A. Mickelson
6995 - A Dana Street
Oakland 9, California

Mr. Philip Wolfe
The RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California

Professor J. Wolfowitz
Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Professor Robert J. Wolfson
CER Inc.
9171 Wilshire Blvd.
Beverly Hills, California

Mr. Marshall K. Wood, Chief
Industrial Vulnerability Branch
Office of Asst. Sec. of Defense
Washington 25, D. C.

Professor M. A. Woodbury
Department of Mathematics
New York University
New York 53, New York

Distribution via OER London

Commanding Officer
Branch Office
Navy No. 100
Fleet Post Office
New York, New York

Professor Maurice Allais
62 Boulevard St. Michel (VI^e)
Paris 6e, FRANCE

Mr. William M. Gorman
Department of Mathematics
Birmingham, ENGLAND

Mr. Frank Hahn
Department of Economics
Churchill College
Cambridge, ENGLAND

Dr. Rudolf Huser
Institut für angewandte Mathematik
Universität Bern
Bern, SWITZERLAND

M. Jacques Lasourne
Société des Mathématiques
Appliquées
33 rue Mogador
Paris 9e, FRANCE

Dr. Edmond Malinvaud
Institut National de la Statistique
et des Etudes Economiques
29, quai Branly
Paris, FRANCE

Professor Maurice McManus
Faculty of Commerce
and Social Science
University of Birmingham
Birmingham, England

Professor Dr. Heinz Guesemann
Institut für Fremdenverkehrswissenschaft
Grafstrasse 39
Frankfurt a.M., GERMANY

Professor Henri Theil
Econometric Institute
Netherlands School of Economics
Rotterdam, NETHERLANDS

Distribution via OER San Francisco

U. S. Attache
Attache for Air (Tokyo, Japan)
APO - 500
San Francisco, California

Professor Michio Morishima
Institute of Social and Economic
Research
Osaka University
Toyonaka, Osaka
JAPAN

Takashi Negishi
112 Sanyacho Nagonaka
Tokyo, JAPAN

Dr. Rukusane Nishido
Institute of Social and Economic
Research
Osaka University
Toyonaka, Osaka
JAPAN

Dr. Tsumehiko Matsuda
Dept. of Economics
Osaka University
Majiro, Toyonaka
Toyonaka, JAPAN

Professor Takuma Tanai
Department of Economics
Tohoku University
Sendai, JAPAN

Other Foreign Addresses

Jan Kmenta
School of Economics
University of N. S. Wales
Kensington, N. S. Wales, AUSTRALIA

Professor David Slater
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario
CANADA

Professor D. V. T. Bear
Dept. Economics
University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

Additional copies for project leader
and assistants and reserve for future
requirements.

Contract Nonr-225(50)
November 1961
(27)